REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed January 13, 2009, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-16 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1-16 have been amended, and new claim 17 has been added. As a result, claims 1-17 are pending for examination with claims 1, 2, and 7 being independent.

I.   Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claims 6 and 8 due to alleged informalities. Each of claims 6 and 8 has been amended to address the noted informalities, and it is respectfully requested that the objections be withdrawn.

II.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over PCT Application WO 01/31634 ("Mishelevich") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,741 ("Emam"). Although Applicants do not concede that these rejections are proper, each of the independent claims has been amended to add a limitation that recites a lexicon of alternatives, the lexicon of alternatives comprising at least some entries that are updated based on information about at least one previous correction made by the correction device, which is not disclosed or suggested in Mishelevich or Emam.

Other amendments to the claims have also been made, not in response to the rejections set forth in the Office Action, but to broaden the claims in other respects or more positively recite aspects of various claim features. For example, references in the claims to the lexicon of alternatives containing word parts, words and word sequences has been deleted and Applicants hereby disavow any prior arguments about distinguishing the claims over the prior art based on these limitations. As another example, claims 3-6 have been broadened by replacing the term "analysis means" with the term "analyzer" to indicate that claims 3-6 are not intended to be interpreted as means-plus-function claims.

A.   Overview of Embodiments of Applicants' Invention

Speech recognition and correction systems operate to transcribe spoken text into recognized text and some systems recognize and correct errors within words and word sequences during transcription (Specification, page 1, lines 15-17). Applicants have recognized that such systems may be improved by storing a lexicon of alternatives on a correction device, such that the correction of texts recognized by a speech recognition system can be carried out in a more simple and rapid manner (Specification, page 3, lines 32-34). Entries in the lexicon of alternatives are created at least in part from sources of knowledge that are independent from the transcription by the speech recognition device (Specification, page 4, lines 5-8). Furthermore, the contents of at least some of the entries in the lexicon of alternatives are updated based on at least one previous correction made by the correction device (Specification, page 6, lines 5-7).

The foregoing summary is provided to assist the Examiner in appreciating some applications for various aspects of the invention. However, this summary may not apply to each of the independent claims, and the language of the independent claims may differ in material respects from the summary provided above. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that careful consideration be given to the language of each of the independent claims and that each be addressed on its own merits, without relying on the summary provided above. In this respect, Applicants do not rely on the summary provided above to distinguish any of the claims over the prior art. Rather, Applicants rely only upon the arguments provided below.

B. The Combination of Mishelevich and Emam Fails to Disclose or Suggest All Limitations of Any of Independent Claims 1, 2, and 7

Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a speech recognition and correction system, and includes a limitation that recites, "wherein the correction device comprises a lexicon of alternatives, the lexicon of alternatives comprising a plurality of entries, at least some of which are displayed by the correction device as alternatives to individual word parts, words and/or word sequences of the recognized text, **wherein at least some of the plurality of entries in the lexicon of alternatives are updated**

based on information about at least one previous correction made by the correction device"
(emphasis added). Neither Mishelevich nor Emam discloses or suggests this limitation of claim 1.

Mishelevich is directed to a proofreading system which uses a sound file of oral input data
and a text file of the oral input data transcribed by a speech recognition device to detect and correct
errors in the transcribed text file (Mishelevich, abstract). The speech recognition device of
Mishelevich includes speech recognition software that uses a language model and a dictionary to
which a user may add new words (Mishelevich, page 6, lines 29-31). The system of Mishelevich
also includes other dictionaries containing single-word or multi-word phrases that are used by the
speech recognition software to generate a list of alternatives to words that are detected as being
potentially erroneous in the transcribed text file (Mishelevich, page 14, lines 11-15). Either a user
or a computer-implemented proofreader may choose from among the alternatives to correct the
potential error (Mishelevich, Col. 15, lines 9-11).

When corrections to the transcribed text file are made by a user or the proofreader, the
selected replacement word or phrase and an associated audio snippet are saved and used as feedback
to retrain the speech recognition software to improve future transcription (Mishelevich, page 15,
lines 7-9; Fig. 9, elements 918, 920). However, this feedback is only used to retrain the speech
recognition software, and the feedback is not used to update an entry in the dictionaries that the
speech recognition software employs to generate the list of alternatives. In contrast, claim 1 recites,
"wherein at least some of the plurality of entries in the lexicon of alternatives are updated based on
information about at least one previous correction made by the correction device." Thus, even if the
dictionaries of Mishelevich are considered to be a lexicon of alternatives as recited in claim 1,
which Applicants do not concede, none of the entries in the dictionaries of Mishelevich are updated
based on information about at least one previous correction.

Emam fails to cure this deficiency of Mishelevich. Emam is directed to a speech recognition
system which uses a segmented vocabulary (e.g., a vocabulary of phones) during the transcription
process to more efficiently decode speech from highly inflected languages such as German or
Arabic (Emam, Col. 8, lines 30-47). Emam fails to disclose or suggest a correction device or a
lexicon of alternatives. Accordingly, Emam also fails to disclose or suggest, "wherein at least some

of the plurality of entries in the lexicon of alternatives are updated base on information about at least one previous correction made by the correction device," as recited in claim 1.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Mishelevich and Emam and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 2

Claim 2 is directed to a correction device, and recites *inter alia*, "wherein at least some of the plurality of data record entries in the lexicon of alternatives are updated based on information about at least one previous correction made by the correction device."

As should be appreciated from the foregoing discussion of claim 1, the combination of Mishelevich and Emam fails to disclose or suggest this limitation of claim 2 and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn. Claims 3-6 depend from claim 2 and each patentably distinguishes over Mishelevich and Emam for at least the same reasons.

Claim 7

Claim 7 is directed to a computer-implemented method of creating a data record entry in a lexicon of alternatives, and includes a limitation that recites, "including the text elements that can be confused with one another as a list of alternatives in the data record entry of the lexicon of alternatives; **wherein the list of alternatives in the data record entry is based on at least one previous correction of the recognized text**" (emphasis added).

As should be appreciated from the foregoing discussion, the combination of Mishelevich and Emam fails to disclose or suggest this limitation of claim 7 and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn. Claims 8-16 depend from claim 7 and each patentably distinguishes over Mishelevich and Emam for at least the same reasons.

III. New Claim 17

Dependent claim 17 is newly added to this application and patentably distinguishes over the combination of Mishelevich and Emam for at least the same reasons as claim 7 from which claim 17 depends.

IV. General Comments on Dependent Claims

Since each of the dependent claims depends from a base claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, for the sake of brevity, Applicants believe that it is unnecessary at this time to argue the further distinguishing features of the dependent claims. However, Applicants do not necessarily concur with the interpretation of the dependent claims as set forth in the Office Action, nor do Applicants concur that the basis for rejection of any of the dependent claims is proper. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to specifically address the further patentability of the dependent claims in the future.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of the application.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: _4/13/09_____

Respectfully submitted,

By:_____
Daniel T. Wehner, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 63,480

Richard F. Giunta
Registration No.: 36,149
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
617.646.8000